



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VII.—REJOINDER TO MR. POSTGATE.

Gladly availing myself of the courtesy extended by the editor of this Journal, I shall reply to Mr. Postgate's remarks on my paper "Horace and Tibullus" (A. J. P. XXXIII 149 f.).

The main part of my paper—the interpretation of Horace's Epistle to Albius—Mr. Postgate scarcely touches upon. Many of his remarks are based, as I shall attempt to show, on misunderstanding of my words, due largely, it seems to me, to hasty reading on his part, and made easier by my intentional brevity in a portion of my paper that was, as I stated, chiefly introductory.

Mr. Postgate is inexact in stating that I "treat the proper name (Glycera) as a common one". I do not go so far, as my words show. The quotation from Cicero does not affect my point. It *is* true, Cicero and Mr. Postgate notwithstanding, that Gaia is commonly used in inscriptions merely to indicate that the person referred to without specific name is a woman and not a man; in fact, *mulieris* is sometimes used in exactly the same way.¹ So there is a general similarity between the use of Gaia and that of Glycera as I see it; i. e., Gaia stands to *mulier* about as Glycera to *meretrix*. Of course the similarity is only a general one, as I tried to indicate without lengthy explanation by saying that "the use of Glycera *corresponds* to that of Gaia". Mr. Postgate's argument concerning Richard Roe and Shylock seems to me irrelevant. I do not see what it has to do with the matter in hand, and can account for it only by supposing that in a hasty reading of my words he assumed that I meant that Glycera = mulier = Gaia. Mr. Postgate asserts that Latin has no means of distinguishing between 'Jehu' and 'a jehu' or 'the jehu'. But is this altogether correct? Latin can often distinguish by the context. And after all I do not maintain that Horace's use of Glycera is *exactly* like that of jehu. I did not think it necessary to state that in this phenomenon of making proper nouns common there were various degrees. The extreme stage would be the use of an original proper noun as a

¹ Cf., e. g., Egbert, Latin Inscriptions, p. 101.

common noun alone. Next would be its use as a common noun most of the time. Jehu is in this class perhaps. Then come various stages in which the proper name approaches a common noun in force, where it is a type-name. Here Glycera belongs. A closer English parallel than any I gave is Hodge (American 'Rube') in which the proper name has been almost completely sunk in the appellative—caprimulgus aut fossor. My idea as to Glycera is best indicated by the interpretation I gave of Horace's line—though of course Horace puts it much more tactfully—"Albius, do not grieve overmuch when you think of the bitter-sweet Glycera, for she is only a *meretrix* after all".

Perhaps, however, Mr. Postgate will not be satisfied without Latin parallels. I therefore append a few. The use, for example, of Charybdis as a general term for a monstrous female being, as in Horace, Carm. I. 27. 19, belongs to the same general phenomenon. So also Martial's Penelope venit, abiit Helene (I. 62. 6). But an exact parallel is to be found in the use of Neaera (one of the names, by the way, that Horace uses) by Prudentius *Περὶ στεφανῶν* 10. 239:

Fusos rotantem cernimus Tirynthium:
Cur, si Neaerae non fuit ludibrio?

Contra Symmach. Or. I. 135 f.:

... temulentus adulter
Invenit ... scortum ...
Hanc iubet assumptam ... Neeram
Secum in deliciis fluitantis stare triumpho.

In the first passage Iole is contemptuously alluded to, in the second, Ariadne. On the first passage the Delphin edition has the note: Neaera communi vocabulo dicitur quaevis mulier lasciva et infamis. For Glycera, we may compare Ausonius, Epigr. 39 (18): Laidas et Glyceras, lascivae nomina famae. Horace, therefore, uses the term Glycera in place of Nemesis, not with the intention of naming the girl, but of characterizing her—in order to show Albius that she was not worth weeping over forever.

Horace uses the name Glycera four times. The reader may judge for himself whether I was justified in saying 'a number of times'. What is Mr. Postgate's minimum number for this phrase? I do *not* believe nor did I state that Horace always

uses the word *Glycera* as a *substitute* for the word *meretrix*. Even Jehu sometimes refers to the biblical character. I think, however, that in each case it is apparent that Horace uses *Glycera* as a *designation* for a *meretrix*. Thus, it seems to me, there is justification for the statement that *Glycera* is used by Horace as a class name. Mr. Postgate seems to believe that all four *Glyceras* were one and the same person. I certainly do not. Are we to assume that Horace and *Albius* were rivals for the same girl and that Horace was trying to persuade *Albius* to leave the field to himself? *Pholoe* and *Myrtale* are mere names too, and I distinctly called *Pholoe* a type-name. Does Mr. Postgate believe that all the persons mentioned by Horace under Greek names were real? In I. 17 *Cyrus* loves *Tyndaris*, in I. 33, *Pholoe*. Shall we write a biography of *Cyrus* and try to determine which sweetheart preceded the other? Shall we puzzle over the identity of *Opuntian Megilla's* brother?

Mr. Postgate attacks an ode of Horace as if it were a legal document: to him Horace either must mean just exactly what he says or must be convicted of perjury. Will this method of treating poetry find favor with admirers of the Odes? I gave reasons why Horace chose to use the name *Glycera* instead of *Nemesis* and to say *iunior* for *ditior*.¹ Mr. Postgate's challenge is impressive, but proves nothing. My whole point is that the name *Glycera*, with its connotation, is itself an explanation of Horace's failure to use the name *Nemesis*.

To support his assertion that my interpretation of Horace's Epistle I. 4 is fantastical, Mr. Postgate examines my treatment of a single line—a manifestly unfair procedure. I grant that a detail here and there in my treatment may not strike all as plausible, but that need not invalidate my interpretation as a whole—and it is this that is important. Let us see, however, how matters stand with regard to this line. Of course none of the words in it has the connotation I suggest in every passage in which it occurs. Few words have absolutely fixed meanings in themselves—context is very important. Mr. Postgate thinks that *reptare* here means the same as in Pliny, Ep. I. 24. 4: to saunter. But how does he know, except by the context, that it has that meaning in Pliny? I could quote plenty of passages in

¹ If my explanation does not please, one can still fall back on the defence that the rival may have been both richer and younger than Tibullus.

which *reptare* means to crawl—how can Mr. Postgate prove, except by the context, that Pliny does not mean that the gentleman crawls along on hands and knees—or on his paunch? As for *salubris*, Mr. Postgate's interpretation would make the word otiose and worthless in its context. I endeavored to explain *tacitum*, *reptare* and all the other words in such a way that they would form a harmonious conception. The only way in which my interpretation can be refuted is by offering a more plausible one *for the whole poem*, or by showing that I have given *impossible* meanings to words, or have failed to indicate the thought connections. Mr. Postgate does not say that the meanings I give to *reptare* and *salubris* are impossible. I am quite willing to admit that they do not *always* have the connotation I see in them in the Epistle.¹

That Mr. Postgate believed that Porphyrio got his information from Suetonius seemed to me a fair inference from a reading of the first paragraph of page 180 of his "Selections", especially the last sentence: "We may thus dismiss Diomedes and Porphyrio as the historian of the Caesars is a much older witness". And, furthermore, if the author of the *Vita* derived his information from Suetonius, as Mr. Postgate assumed in his "Selections", and if, as Mr. Postgate believes, Suetonius used only the sources which we have, he must himself have identified Albius with Tibullus.

Mr. Postgate misinterprets my attitude towards the *Vita* and Suetonius. It was Mr. Postgate's *method* that I objected to. The impression that one is apt to get from this method of reasoning is 1) that the evidence of the *Vita* is much more important (being older in origin) than that of Porphyrio and Diomedes; 2) that this importance is nil; 3) that, therefore, Porphyrio and Diomedes are minus quantities. I would much prefer to have the *Vita* dismissed with the charge that it is late and worthless. Personally I do not feel at all sure, though I am inclined to that view, that it goes back to antiquity, much less that we can definitely assign it to Suetonius or any other individual. Even if it comes ultimately from Suetonius, it does not follow that it reproduces all that Suetonius wrote. But if we leave it out of con-

¹ When I say "*tacitum shows* that he is brooding, melancholy", I do not mean that *tacitum means* melancholy. As Mr. Postgate says, *tacitum* means "not inclined to talk", which shows, in this particular context, that Albius was melancholy.

sideration entirely, the question then becomes a plain one as to where Porphyrio got the identification. Mr. Postgate's explanation of its origin does not strike me as plausible.

So far as the present question is concerned I have no interest in Suetonius' credibility, and Mr. Postgate's diatribe against him is wasted. Nor do I follow the logic in the queries with which Mr. Postgate concludes. Supposing that we concede 1) that the statement which he quotes cannot be true, and that we agree 2) that Suetonius wrote it, how does that prove 3) that the identification of Albius and Tibullus is wrong?¹

B. L. ULLMAN.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

¹ In his third query Mr. Postgate asks whether I am now quite comfortable in my mind as to the value of Suetonius *or other* identifications. The 'or other' is, unfortunately for his logic, an admission that I did not hold that Suetonius was the source of all our information. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether he was the source of any of it.